

Truthful Aggregation of LLMs with an Application to Online Advertising

Ermis Soumalias

University of Zurich and ETH AI Center, ermis@ifi.uzh.ch

Michael Curry

Harvard University, University of Zurich and ETH AI Center, mcurry@seas.harvard.edu

Sven Seuken

University of Zurich and ETH AI Center, seuken@ifi.uzh.ch

Online platforms generate hundreds of billions of dollars in revenue per year by showing advertisements alongside their own content. Currently, these platforms are integrating Large Language Models (LLMs) into their services. This makes revenue generation from LLM-generated content the next major challenge in online advertising. We consider a scenario where advertisers aim to influence the responses of an LLM to align with their interests, while platforms seek to maximize advertiser value and ensure user satisfaction. We introduce an auction mechanism for this problem that operates without LLM fine-tuning or access to model weights and provably converges to the output of the optimally fine-tuned LLM for the platform’s objective as computational resources increase. Our mechanism ensures that truthful reporting is a dominant strategy for advertisers and it aligns each advertiser’s utility with their contribution to social welfare – an essential feature for long-term viability. Additionally, it can incorporate contextual information about the advertisers, significantly accelerating convergence. Via experiments with a publicly available LLM, we show that our mechanism significantly boosts advertiser value and platform revenue, with low computational overhead. While our motivating application is online advertising, our mechanism can be applied in any setting with monetary transfers, making it a general-purpose solution for truthfully aggregating the preferences of self-interested agents over LLM-generated replies.

1. Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) are becoming ubiquitous – as coding assistants, as chat interfaces, as complements to search engines, and for many other applications (Bommasani et al. 2022). To ensure their usefulness, it is essential to align LLM outputs closely with user preferences. In general, though, there may be multiple interested parties who disagree over the desired behavior of *the same* model. How should we guide language model behavior to respect multiple conflicting preferences?

As a practical motivation for our work, we focus on online advertising. Over the years, advertising has established itself as the main source of revenue for large tech companies such as Google, Meta, and Twitter. In 2023, Meta’s advertising revenue of 132 billion USD was over 97% of its total revenue, with auctions being the workhorse mechanism determining the placement and prices of

commercial content (Varian 2007, Edelman et al. 2007). As existing platforms begin to heavily integrate LLMs into their services, new auction mechanisms have to be created for this application.

In this paper, we present a new auction mechanism for this problem. The agents are paying not for some particular item or bundle, but rather to influence the output generated by an LLM in a direction closer to their own preferences. While our mechanism could be of interest whenever one has to aggregate the preferences of multiple self-interested agents over LLM behavior (as long as it is reasonable to charge monetary payments), we see online advertising as the most salient setting of interest. For this reason, we use the terms *advertiser* and *agent* interchangeably.

1.1. Concrete problem setting

Consider a situation where a user has queried an LLM for a specific task. We assume the following:

- There is a *reference LLM* that can produce useful replies to the user’s query.
- There are *agents* who would like to be represented in the reply back to the user.

In our model, the agents can be represented either via their own LLMs or directly with a *reward function*, similar to the function used to fine-tune their LLMs in the *Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback* pipeline (Azar et al. 2023). For this reason, we refer to an agent’s value for a reply as her *reward*. The auctioneer’s task is, given the user’s query and the agents’ preferences, to *produce a reply that is useful for the user, while also generating high rewards for the agents*.

Our running example will be the following. A user is interested in baking and queries an LLM “How do I bake cookies.” There are two interested agents, each a different advertiser, who would like to influence the response to the user: *EasyBake*, a company that produces baking ingredients and *KitchenFix*, a company that produces kitchen equipment.

1.2. Challenges

Good outcomes: Our mechanism must produce useful outcomes, in the sense that agents receive high rewards, but without steering the LLM’s behavior too far from that of the “reference” LLM that produces useful replies for the user. We formalize this trade-off in Section 3.

Technical feasibility and practicality: Duetting et al. (2023) argued that auction solutions must be compatible with existing LLM technology, using only “information obtainable from current models” in such a way that they are “easy to integrate into the system” and relying only on “easy manipulations of the LLM outputs.” We strongly agree with these desiderata and adopt them for our work. Additionally, it must be computationally feasible to run the auction mechanism repeatedly and with many different agent preferences. In particular, we cannot afford the expensive process of fine-tuning an LLM’s weights for each possible user query. We explain how our mechanism satisfies these requirements in Section 4.1. The key idea is that our mechanism works only by post-processing multiple LLM outputs – it requires only “API access” and does not require modifying or even viewing the model weights.

Mechanism design desiderata: Agents might have an interest in misreporting their preferences to get a better outcome, analogous to over/under-bidding in traditional auctions. We design an auction where there is no such incentive for any agent, no matter what the other agents do: a mechanism with this property is called *strategyproof*. In traditional auctions, another sensible property is *ex-post individual rationality (IR)*, where participating and reporting truthfully guarantees that an agent is at least as well off as not participating. In Section 5.2, we discuss the unique properties of our setting that make ex-post IR unattainable. In Section 5.3.1 we show that our mechanism is, however, “almost IR” and in Section 6.2.1, we experimentally show that our mechanism is *ex-ante* IR, meaning that an agent is in expectation better off by participating.

1.3. Overview of Contributions

We present a novel auction mechanism designed to aggregate the preferences of multiple self-interested agents over LLM-generated replies. We make several key contributions. First, our mechanism allows for an interpretable, principled way of balancing between the usefulness of the produced reply to the user and the agents’ preferences (Section 3.1). Second, it is the only mechanism in the literature that converges to the optimal distribution as computational resources are increased (Corollary 1). Third, it can incorporate contextual information, similar to how sponsored search auctions utilize advertiser descriptions. This boosts performance (Section 6.2.1), accelerating convergence and increasing value for the agents and revenue for the auctioneer.

Fourth, our mechanism is strategyproof, in the sense that it is a dominant strategy for each agent to truthfully report her preferences (Theorem 1). Crucially, this holds even if the allocation rule has not converged to optimality. Fifth, our mechanism is equitable in the sense that each agent’s utility is proportional to her contribution to the social welfare. This alignment is vital for the long-term success of a market for this setting, incentivizing the most relevant agents to participate.

The flagship application of our mechanism is online advertising. Our experiments in this domain (Section 6) demonstrate that our mechanism quickly converges to the optimal distribution with low computational cost, generating significant value for the advertisers and revenue for the auctioneer. Moreover, it maintains the desired equity property while ensuring positive advertiser utility.

2. Prior Work

Duetting et al. (2023) were the first to suggest an auction mechanism for LLMs. The authors proposed a sequential mechanism, where the output sequence is generated on a token-by-token basis and the advertisers bid each time for their LLM to generate the next token. However, their approach suffers from significant limitations: (i) For a given prompt, an advertiser’s spend grows with the length of the generated sequence. (ii) Advertisers suffer from the *exposure problem*: Adding a “not” to a sequence completely changes its meaning, and an advertiser could have paid a significant

amount for the sequence generated up to some point, not expecting a negation in its continuation. (iii) The mechanism is easily manipulable if the assumption that advertisers cannot misreport their LLMs is dropped. (iv) The authors prove that an advertiser bidding higher leads to an aggregate distribution for the next token that she prefers; however, they do not provide any guarantees on the distribution of the resulting full output sequence. Our mechanism handles all of these limitations.

Dubey et al. (2024) proposed a generalization of the position auction (Varian 2007, Edelman et al. 2007) to a setting where each advertiser is interested in having their text ad displayed, and an LLM module coupled with an auction module work together to merge the ads into a single summary in an incentive-compatible way. Their mechanism takes as input the ad creative of each advertiser and, given a prediction model of click through rates, creates a summary of those creatives that maximizes advertiser welfare, defined as the dot product of the advertisers’ values per click times their predicted click through rate. By comparison, our mechanism takes as input directly the advertisers’ rewards for some sequences (or equivalently, the probabilities of those sequences with respect to the advertiser LLMs, see Section 4.1), and outputs a reply that follows in the limit the theoretically optimal distribution, maximizing expected advertiser reward while remaining close to the distribution induced by a reference LLM responsible for creating a useful reply for the user.

Feizi et al. (2024) presented an abstract design for an LLM advertising system and detailed a number of research challenges that would have to be overcome in the course of implementation. Conitzer et al. (2024) drew connections between *computational social choice* and LLM alignment. Social choice theory is closely related to auction design, with different emphases: it is typical in social choice to think in terms of ordinal rather than cardinal preferences, and monetary payments are typically not charged. Fish et al. (2023) presented work in the opposite direction: how can LLMs be used to solve problems in social choice? Harris et al. (2024) studied Bayesian persuasion in an abstract setting where a “simulator” (for example, a realistic LLM) of the agent is available.

3. Framing Sequence Generation as a Mechanism Design Problem

3.1. Formal Model

A *user* issues a query x . There is a *reference LLM* π_{ref} that the auctioneer aims not to deviate from too much (e.g., because it is responsible for providing useful replies to the user). Additionally, there is a set N of n agents (e.g., advertisers) who have their own preferences for the reply (i.e., a token sequence) that will be returned to the user. We use the terms *sequence* and *reply* interchangeably.

An LLM can be abstracted as a mapping from (partial) token sequences to a distribution over the next token, or equivalently as an implicit probability distribution over token sequences. We use this second abstraction, i.e., $\pi_i(y|x)$ denotes the probability that agent i ’s LLM π_i assigns to output sequence (i.e., reply) y for the user query x .

We let $r_i(x, y)$ denote agent i 's *reward* for sequence y , given query x .¹ Informally, the auctioneer's goal is to sample the final sequence from a distribution that optimizes the agents' expected rewards without substantially diverging from π_{ref} . Formally, the goal is to maximize:

$$J(\pi) = \mathbb{E}_{y \sim \pi} \left[\sum_{i \in N} r_i(x, y) \right] - \tau D_{\text{KL}}(\pi(\cdot|x) || \pi_{\text{ref}}(\cdot|x)) \quad (1)$$

where $\tau > 0$ is a hyperparameter enabling the auctioneer to control the trade-off between producing replies more faithful to the reference policy or with higher reward for the agents, and D_{KL} refers to the Kullback-Leibler divergence.

This objective mirrors the standard Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF) approach (Ziegler et al. 2020), but replaces the human feedback reward function $r_{\text{HF}}(x, y)$ with the sum of the agents' rewards. For an overview of RLHF, we recommend Rafailov et al. (2023, §3).

The optimal solution to the optimization problem in (1) was derived by Peters and Schaal (2007):

$$\pi_r(y|x) = \frac{1}{Z(x)} \pi_{\text{ref}}(y|x) \exp \left(\frac{1}{\tau} \sum_{i \in N} r_i(x, y) \right), \quad (2)$$

where $Z(x) = \sum_{y \in T^*} \pi_{\text{ref}}(y|x) \exp \left(\frac{1}{\tau} \sum_{i \in N} r_i(x, y) \right)$ is the partition function normalizing $\pi_r(\cdot|x)$.

Let \vec{R} be the set of all possible reports by the agents. A *mechanism* is defined as a pair (π, p) . The *allocation rule* $\pi: \vec{R} \rightarrow \Delta(T^*)$ maps any report profile $\vec{r} = (r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n) \in \vec{R}$ of the agents' rewards to a distribution over sequences $\delta(T^*)$. We denote the agents' *aggregate reward* as $r(x, y) = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i(x, y)$, and their reward profile as $\vec{r}(x, y) = (r_1(x, y), r_2(x, y), \dots, r_n(x, y))$. The *payment rule* $p: \vec{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ maps any report profile of the agents' rewards to a payment profile \vec{p} , where \vec{p}_i is the payment of the i -th agent to the mechanism.

A mechanism is *strategyproof* if and only if, for any agent $i \in N$, reporting her rewards truthfully is always optimal for her, no matter the other agents' reports. More formally:

DEFINITION 1 (STRATEGYPROOF MECHANISM). A mechanism (π, p) is *strategyproof* iff for all agents $i \in N$, for all true rewards $\vec{r}_i \in \vec{R}_i$, for all reports $\vec{r}_{-i} \in \vec{R}_{-i}$ by the other agents and for all possible agent i misreports $\vec{r}_i^* \in \vec{R}_i$: $\mathbb{E}_{y \sim \pi(\vec{r})} [u_i(y, \vec{r}_i, \vec{r}_{-i}; r_i, x)] \geq \mathbb{E}_{y' \sim \pi(\vec{r}_i^*, \vec{r}_{-i}, x)} [u_i(y, \vec{r}_i^*, \vec{r}_{-i}; \vec{r}_i^*)]$, where $u_i(y, \vec{r}_i, \vec{r}_{-i}; r_i, x) = r_i(x, y) - p_i(\vec{r})$ is the utility of agent i for sequence y to be returned in the report profile $\vec{r} = (\vec{r}_i, \vec{r}_{-i})$ when the agent's reward is $r_i(x, \cdot)$.

¹ In theory, the agent's reward for a generated sequence could also depend on user-specific information, but we abstract that away. Equivalently, we assume that the reward function r_i provided by agent i is specific to the given user that asked the query x .

Algorithm 1: Context-Aware Allocation Rule

Input: User prompt x , reference LLM π_{ref} , context-aware LLM used for candidate sequence generation π_{con} , advertiser reward functions \vec{r} , advertiser descriptions \vec{c} , sentences to sample M , regularization parameter τ

Output: Output sequence y drawn according to the optimal distribution as defined in

$$\text{Equation (1) for the aggregate reward function } r(x, y) = \sum_{i=1}^N r_i(x, y)$$

Sample $y_j \sim \pi_{\text{con}}(\cdot|x; \vec{c})$, $1 \leq j \leq M$

Calculate $r(x, y_j) = \sum_{i=1}^N r_i(x, y_j)$, $1 \leq j \leq M$

Sample $y \sim \text{softmax} \left(\frac{r(x, y_1)}{\tau} + \log \frac{\pi_{\text{ref}}(y_1|x)}{\pi_{\text{con}}(y_1|x; \vec{c})}, \dots, \frac{r(x, y_M)}{\tau} + \log \frac{\pi_{\text{ref}}(y_M|x)}{\pi_{\text{con}}(y_M|x; \vec{c})} \right)$

return Output sequence y

3.2. The shortcomings of VCG in this setting

The most celebrated auction mechanism is the Vickrey-Clarke-Groves (VCG) mechanism (Vickrey 1961, Clarke 1971, Groves 1973). VCG’s allocation rule selects the outcome that maximizes the sum of all agents’ values.² This can be either the single optimal sequence in Equation (1), or the optimal distribution of Equation (2). The VCG mechanism has a corresponding payment rule to incentivize truthful reporting: it charges each agent her externality, i.e., the total reduction in value (respectively expected value) for the other agents that her participation in the mechanism caused.

In our setting however, VCG is not a viable option: VCG’s allocation rule requires calculating the *exact* optimal solution to the optimization problem, which is hopeless for choosing an LLM to maximize Equation (1) and even difficult for choosing a single optimal sequence. If a suboptimal solution is chosen, VCG’s strategyproofness is no longer guaranteed (Nisan and Ronen 2007, 1999, Lehmann et al. 2002). Thus, VCG is not a suitable mechanism in our setting.

4. Our Mechanism: Allocation Rule

In this section, we introduce our mechanism’s allocation rule. The high level idea is that first, a set of M *candidate sequences* are generated based on some LLM responsible for that task π_{con} . Then, the probability of returning each candidate sequence is re-weighted based on the advertisers’ reports and the reference LLM π_{ref} so that in the limit as $M \rightarrow \infty$, the probability of returning each sequence converges to its probability under the optimal distribution of Equation (2). This approach shares similarities with the rejection sampling approach which has been used at various points of the LLM training pipeline, e.g., Bai et al. (2022). We defer all proofs to Section EC.1.

² Note that in Equation (1) the regularization term can also be interpreted as an agent, with value for sequence y of $-\tau \pi(y|x) \log \frac{\pi(y|x)}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(y|x)}$. In the rest of the paper, the term agents will refer only to the advertisers.

COROLLARY 1. *The limiting policy $\pi_{\theta,M}(\cdot|x)$ induced by Algorithm 1 is the KL regularized policy that optimizes the aggregate reward function:*

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \pi_{\theta,M}(\cdot|x) = \arg \max_{\pi} \mathbb{E}_{y \sim \pi(\cdot|x)} [r(x, y)] - \tau D_{KL}(\pi || \pi_{ref}) \quad (3)$$

Based on Corollary 1, our allocation rule converges to the optimal distribution for *any* LLM π_{con} that generates in the limit any sequence that has a non-zero probability under the optimal distribution. The obvious choice is π_{ref} . However, the practical convergence rate for that choice would be very slow. The reason is that π_{ref} may only generate sequences with high rewards for the advertisers exceedingly rarely. Consider the online advertising scenario. The advertisers have high rewards for sequences that explicitly mention their brands. But π_{ref} deems sequences with mentions to specific brands as exceedingly unlikely. Thus, if we used π_{ref} to generate the candidate sequences, Algorithm 1 would sample the final sequence from a set of candidate sequences which would likely not mention any specific brands, and thus have low rewards for the advertisers.

To address this and related challenges, we generate candidate sequences not from $\pi_{ref}(\cdot|x)$, but instead from a *context-aware LLM*, $\pi_{con}(\cdot|x; \vec{c})$. The instance-specific context \vec{c} is designed to bridge the gap between the parts of the output space favored by π_{ref} and those valued by the advertisers.

In our application of integrating advertisers’ interests into LLM outputs, \vec{c}_i is a context-specific description of the i -th advertiser. These descriptions, supplied by the advertisers themselves, should be easily verifiable and factually accurate, akin to “EasyBake: producing baking ingredients”, or “KitchenFix: currently offering promotions on baking ovens.”³ This approach is analogous to search engine optimization in sponsored search advertising, where advertisers supply and potentially optimize their own descriptions to influence how they are presented by the auction mechanism.

Our experiments in Section 6.2.1 demonstrate that, within computationally reasonable limits, using the context-aware LLM to generate candidate sequences achieves substantially higher rewards and utility for the advertisers, increased revenue for the auctioneer, and faster convergence. In the rest of the paper, we refer to using the reference and context-aware LLMs as the baseline and context-aware versions of our mechanisms, respectively.

4.1. Applicability and Practical Considerations of the Mechanism

Generation of Candidate Sequences. The computationally most expensive part of our mechanism is the generation of candidate sequences, requiring an LLM inference call for the generation of each candidate sequence, and potentially an additional n inference calls to calculate all agents’ rewards it. Thus, the computational cost of our mechanism scales linearly in the number of candidate sequences, underscoring the importance of approximating the optimal distribution with few candidate sequences.

³ A practical way of implementing $\pi_{con}(\cdot|x; c)$ given $\pi_{ref}(\cdot|x)$ is to augment the input x to the reference LLM with the advertiser descriptions. In our example: “Try to mention \langle advertiser x \rangle , \langle advertiser x description \rangle .”

Input Methods and Computational Efficiency. Both our allocation and payment rule (introduced in Section 5) do not depend on the agents’ full reward functions, but only on their rewards for the candidate sequences. Thus, our mechanism requires only “API access” to the involved LLMs without fine-tuning or access to their weights. Rafailov et al. (2023) establish a mapping between an agent’s LLM and her implicit reward function, allowing our mechanism to use as inputs sequence probabilities (i.e., LLM inference calls) instead of rewards. For more details, see Section EC.2.3.

Our mechanism can be integrated with computationally efficient methods for eliciting agents’ reward functions and sampling from the base LLM, reducing computational overhead. For instance, Li et al. (2024) demonstrate that a simple linear function on a model’s embedding space can approximate a model’s reward function. If agents’ reward functions are represented this way, an auction instance with M candidate sequences and n agents would require only M LLM inference calls instead of $n \cdot M$, and $n \cdot M$ linear multiplications, reducing overhead by a factor of n .

Parallelization. The generation and evaluation of each candidate sequence are independent processes. This independence allows our mechanism to be fully parallelized, ensuring that the response time for a user query is comparable to that of directly querying an LLM.

5. Our Mechanism: Payment Rule

In this section, we first show how the allocation rule from Section 4 can be combined with an appropriate payment rule so that the resulting mechanism is strategyproof (Section 5.1). Then, we detail how auctions for LLM-generated content differ from standard auctions (Section 5.2). Taking those differences into account, we create a payment offset, so that the mechanism is more equitable while maintaining its strategyproofness property (Section 5.3). We defer all proofs to Section EC.2.

5.1. Strategyproof Payments through Cyclic Monotonicity

The allocation rule we introduced in Section 4 satisfies *cyclic monotonicity*. Cyclic monotonicity was first proposed by Rochet (1987) as a generalization of the monotonicity property in single-parameter settings (Myerson 1981). For general settings, cyclic monotonicity of the allocation rule is a sufficient and necessary condition for the existence of a payment rule so that the resulting mechanism is strategyproof. By applying this theory to our setting we can prove:

THEOREM 1. *Let \vec{r}_{-i} be the reward profile of all agents other than i , and $\vec{\beta}_{-i}$ the aggregate reports of all other agents and the reference and context-aware LLMs. Then, the allocation rule induced by Algorithm 1 can be combined with a payment rule $p: \vec{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that in the mechanism (π, p) for any agent $i \in N$, report profile $\vec{\beta}_{-i}$ and set of generated candidate sequences, reporting truthfully maximizes agent i ’s expected utility, with the expectation taken over the draw of the final sequence from the set of candidate sequences. Agent i ’s utility in (π, p) under truthful bidding is:*

$$U_{C,i}(\vec{r}_i; \vec{\beta}_{-i}) = \tau \log \left(\sum_{j=1}^M \exp \left(\frac{1}{\tau} \sum_{k \in N} r_k(x, y_j) \right) + \log \frac{\pi_{\text{ref}}(y_j|x)}{\pi_{\text{con}}(y_j|x; \vec{c})} \right) + C, \quad C \in \mathbb{R} \quad (4)$$

Note that, based on Theorem 1, in our mechanism it is *always* a dominant strategy for an agent to report truthfully. Crucially, this is not the case for VCG, where truthful reporting would be optimal only if the allocation rule had converged to the optimal distribution as defined in Equation (2).

5.2. Differences from Standard Auction Settings

Standard auction environments rely on assumptions that do not apply to auctions for LLM-generated content. Key differences include: (i) *Non-Negative Values*: Standard auctions assume agents’ values are non-negative due to having zero value for the empty bundle and free disposal. Here, an agent’s reward can go negative based on the discrepancy between her LLM and the reference LLM. (ii) *Agent-Specific Allocations*: Standard auctions allocate different bundles to different agents. Here, a single sequence is produced, and agents’ rewards depend on its probability with respect to their LLMs. (iii) *Zero Utility for Non-Participation*: In standard auctions, not participating yields zero utility. Here, non-participation can result in negative utility since the produced sequence may be unfavorable to non-participating agents. For details, see Appendix EC.2.3.

5.3. Agent-Specific Utility Offset

In this section, we introduce our mechanism’s utility (and thus payment) offset. Our goal is to maintain the nice properties of our mechanism, namely strategyproofness and convergence to the optimal distribution, while also achieving two additional properties that we argue are important for the long-term success of a market for LLM aggregation. That offset is $C = -\tau \log \left(\sum_{j=1}^M \exp \left(\vec{\beta}_{-i,j} \right) \right)$.

Informally, we additionally charge each agent her utility in Equation (4) for bidding zero for all candidate sequences. This maintains strategyproofness, while ensuring the following properties:

- **“Almost IR:”** An agent with weakly positive reward for all generated candidate sequences, has weakly positive expected utility, for all reports by the other agents. In particular, an agent who has zero utility for all outputs is guaranteed zero utility from the mechanism.
- **“What you give is what you get:”** The ex-interim expected utility of an agent is monotone in how well-aligned her exponentiated reward for the sequences is with the interim allocation rule if she were to not participate.

5.3.1. Our Mechanism is “Almost Individually Rational” In Section EC.2.2 we explain why the standard notion of individual rationality (i.e., weakly positive utility from participation in the mechanism) encountered in most auction settings is impossible to achieve in this domain while converging to the optimal distribution and maintaining strategyproofness. Then, we explain how, with our payment offset, our mechanism is “almost IR:” In Lemma EC.1 we prove that the ex-interim utility of an agent who has zero reward for all candidate sequences and bids truthfully is deterministically zero, i.e., agents that do not contribute to the social welfare (but also do not detract from it) have zero utility. Similarly, in Lemma EC.2 we prove that if an agent’s reward for all candidate sequences is (weakly) positive, then her ex-interim utility is (weakly) positive.

REMARK 1. In Section 6 we will experimentally show that this offset, coupled with our generation of candidate sequences based on the context-aware LLM, results in both high expected rewards and positive expected utility for the agents for participating in the mechanism, i.e., ex-ante individual rationality, while at the same time yielding significant revenue to the auctioneer.

5.3.2. “What you give is what you get” Our allocation rule (which is the only allocation rule over a finite set of sequences that converges to the optimal distribution), combined with the fact that the allocation rule is the gradient of the utility to ensure truthfulness, means that agent utilities must also be the same up to potentially agent-specific offsets as indicated by Equation (4).

However, not all agents contribute equally to the social welfare of the final outcome. In section EC.2.4 we detail why implementing the mechanism without a carefully-designed offset would lead to a kind of “reverse market unraveling:” as long as an agent’s utility in Equation (4) is positive, it would incentivize agents for whom the user query is unrelated to participate in the auction. This would reduce everyone’s expected utility, and thus disincentivize the relevant agents to participate, leading to sequences with worse expected rewards for the agents and usefulness for the user. Thus, it is crucial to align each agent’s utility with her contribution to the social welfare.

LEMMA 1. For the offset $C = -\tau \log \left(\sum_{j=1}^M \exp \left(\vec{\beta}_{-i,j} \right) \right)$ agent i ’s ex-interim utility is:

$$U_i(\vec{r}_i; \vec{\beta}_{-i}) = \tau \log \left(\sum_{j=1}^M \exp \left(\frac{r_i(x, y_j)}{\tau} \right) \pi_{int}(y_j | x; \vec{r}_{-i})_j \right) \quad (5)$$

In words, Lemma 1 proves that every agent’s ex-interim utility is monotonic in how well-aligned the interim allocation rule π_{int} (i.e., the probability of returning each of the already generated candidate sequences) without her and her exponentiated rewards for the candidate sequences are.

REMARK 2. In Section 6.2.2 we experimentally show that, with the offset in Section 5.3, there is a strong positive correlation between an advertiser’s contribution to the social welfare and her expected utility gain from participation in the mechanism, and that the relationship between the two quantities is quite linear. Additionally, we show that the context-aware allocation rule combined with the offsetted payment rule constitute an ex-ante IR mechanism.

6. Experiments

In this section, we experimentally evaluate the performance of our mechanism. The experiment focuses on the online advertising application, where the platform’s aim is to maximize advertiser value while ensuring that the replies are useful for the users.

User query

What are effective ways to learn a musical instrument online?

Advertisers

- MusicMastery: offering online music lessons and virtual tutoring
 - InstaTune: selling musical instruments and learning aids
-

Context-Aware Mechanism Output

Effective ways to learn a musical instrument online include:

1. Online music lessons: Platforms like **MusicMastery** offer one-on-one virtual tutoring, group classes, and pre-recorded lessons. These lessons can be tailored to your skill level and learning style.
 2. Interactive learning tools: **InstaTune** offers a range of interactive learning tools, such as apps, software, and games, that make learning fun and engaging...
-

Baseline Mechanism Output

- Practice consistently and regularly: Consistent practice is essential to learning any musical instrument, and it’s even more important when learning online. Set aside a specific time each day or week to practice, and make sure to stick to it.
 - Find a good teacher or mentor: While it’s possible to learn some things on your own, working with a good teacher or mentor can help you improve faster and avoid developing bad habits. . . .
-

Table 1 Comparison of context-aware and baseline mechanism outputs using 10 candidate sequences. Advertisers highlighted in bold, outputs truncated to conserve space.

6.1. Experiment Setup

We create synthetic instances consisting of user queries (e.g., “How do I bake cookies?”) and advertisers (e.g., “KitchenFix, producing kitchen appliances”). We use Llama-2-7b-chat-hf as the reference LLM (Touvron et al. 2023). We create advertisers’ LLMs by adding advertising instructions to the reference LLM. The context-aware LLM is created as described in Footnote 3.


Following Rafailov et al. (2023), advertisers’ reward functions are defined as $r_i(x, y) = \log \frac{\pi_i(y|x)}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(y|x)}$. For the auctioneer’s objective, we set $\tau = 1$ in Equation (1), balancing advertisers’ rewards and sequence divergence from the reference LLM.

We use 50 user queries, each with two advertisers, and test each query on 25 different random seeds, resulting in 1250 instances. Following Li et al. (2024), Rozière et al. (2024) we sample from all LLMs using temperature 0.8 and top-p 0.95. For full experimental details, see Appendix EC.3.1.

6.2. Experimental Results

6.2.1. Evaluating the Allocation Rule In this section, we evaluate the effectiveness of our mechanism’s allocation rule in generating value for advertisers and converging to the optimal distribution. We assess both the baseline and context-aware versions of our mechanism, i.e., using the reference and context-aware LLMs to generate candidate sequences, respectively.

To provide some intuition on how the context-aware mechanism enhances the relevance of responses for advertisers, we compare outputs from both mechanisms in Table EC.1. Notably, only the context-aware mechanism successfully incorporates advertisers into the replies.



(a) Returned sequence log probability as a function of the number of candidate sequences generated using π_{ref} and π_{con} . We also show a proxy of drawing a single sequence from the optimal distribution.

(b) Total advertiser normalized reward as a function of the number of candidate sequences generated using π_{ref} and π_{con} .


Figure 1 Returned sequence log probability and total advertiser normalized reward a function of the number of candidate sequences generated using π_{ref} and π_{con} . Averaged over 1250 runs including 95% CIs.

In Figure 1a, we plot the log probability of the sequences returned by our mechanism with respect to the optimal distribution (Equation (2)) as a function of the number of candidate sequences generated. We compare the context-aware version of our mechanism to the baseline to evaluate the effectiveness of incorporating contextual information. To benchmark our results, we estimate the log probability of sampling a *single sequence* from the optimal distribution.⁴

In Figure 1b, we plot the total expected reward for advertisers as a function of the number of candidate sequences generated by the mechanism. The expectation is taken over the draw of the returned sequence from the candidate sequences. To make the plot more interpretable, we normalize an advertiser’s expected reward by her expected reward had she not participated in the mechanism. Specifically, we plot $r_{i,norm}(x) = \sum_{j \in M} r_i(x, y_j) \cdot \pi_{\text{int}}(y_j|x) - \sum_{j \in M} r_i(x, y_{-i,j}) \cdot \pi_{\text{int}}(y_{-i,j}|x)$, where $y_{-i} = (y_{-i,1}, \dots, y_{-i,M})$ represents the candidate sequences that would have been generated had the advertiser not participated.⁵ We compare the outcomes using the context-aware versus the baseline mechanism, highlighting the added value of integrating context.

⁴ Note that the closed-form solution of Equation (2) allows us to evaluate the probability of sentences with respect to the optimal solution, but it does not enable us to sample from that distribution. Sampling from that distribution would require using reinforcement learning to train the optimal LLM on the agents’ aggregate reward function, which is computationally infeasible for the number of problem instances we test. Instead, we generate replies from the reference LLM and evaluate them based on the induced probabilities of the reference LLM, for which the reference LLM is the optimal one. This serves as a proxy for the log probabilities we should expect if we were to draw replies from the optimally fine-tuned model for each query.

⁵ To reduce computational costs, we estimate an advertiser’s reward for not participating based on her expected reward over the already generated sequences in which her brand is not mentioned by name, motivated by the fact that if she does not participate, her brand will not be mentioned by name.



(a) Revenue as a function of the number of candidate sequences generated using π_{ref} and π_{con} .

(b) Total advertiser normalized utility as a function of the number of candidate sequences generated using π_{ref} and π_{con} .

Figure 2 Total advertiser payments and normalized utility as a function of the number of candidate sequences generated using π_{ref} and π_{con} . Averaged over 1250 runs including 95% CIs.

In Figure 1a we observe that for both the context-aware and baseline versions of our mechanism, the log probability of the returned sequence increases with the number of candidate sequences generated. This is in line with our theoretical analysis in Section 4, where we proved that both versions converge to the optimal distribution in the limit. We also observe that incorporating context into the mechanism significantly accelerates convergence. Notably, the context-aware mechanism can achieve higher log probability with respect to the optimal distribution using only four candidate sequences than the baseline version can achieve with 20. Additionally, with only 20 generated candidate sequences, the context-aware mechanism can almost match our estimate of the log probability of sampling from the optimal distribution.

At the same time, Figure 1b shows that our context-aware mechanism significantly increases advertiser reward, with the benefits scaling rapidly with the number of sequences generated. In contrast, the baseline version of our mechanism that uses the reference LLM is unable to increase advertiser reward within a computationally feasible number of generated sequences. To conclude, our mechanism’s support of context-aware LLMs enables it to quickly converge to the theoretically optimal distribution and generate significant rewards for the advertisers.

6.2.2. Evaluating the Payment Rule In this section, we examine the impact of our payment rule introduced in Section 5.

Figure 2 presents the empirical evaluation of our payment rule that incorporates the agent-specific offset of Section 5.3. In Figure 2a we plot the auctioneer’s revenue (i.e., the total payment by the advertisers) as a function of the number of generated candidate sequences, for both the context-aware and baseline versions of our mechanism. We observe that this payment rule in combination with the context-aware allocation rule results in significant revenue for the auctioneer, which increases rapidly with the number of generated candidate sequences. Furthermore, if we

compare the advertisers’ total payment in Figure 2a with their normalized utility (i.e., normalized reward minus payment) in Figure 2b, we see that our payment rule converts a significant portion of the surplus created for the advertisers into revenue for the auctioneer. At the same time, Figure 2b illustrates that our context-aware allocation rule combined with this payment rule results in positive normalized utility for the advertisers, i.e., their normalized rewards exceed their payments. Finally, the advertisers’ utility also increases with the number of candidate sequences generated.

Figure 3 evaluates the effectiveness of the payment offset introduced in Section 5.3 in aligning advertisers’ contributions to social welfare with their utility. We plot the Pearson correlation between an advertiser’s normalized reward and utility, comparing this correlation under the payment rule ensuring strategyproofness of Theorem 1, with and without the agent-specific offset defined in Section 5.3. This comparison is made as a function of the number of candidate sequences generated by our context-aware allocation rule.




Figure 3: Pearson correlation between advertiser normalized utility and reward.

Our observations show that, for any number of candidate sequences, the agent-specific offset significantly increases the Pearson correlation between an agent’s normalized reward and utility. Furthermore, the Pearson correlation with the agent-specific offset consistently remains above 0.75, indicating a strong linear relationship between the two metrics. This strong linear correlation suggests that the mechanism is more equitable, as higher contributions to social welfare directly translate into greater utility for advertisers. To conclude, we have experimentally shown that our proposed mechanism is ex-ante IR, and that there is a strong positive correlation between an advertiser’s contribution to the social welfare and her expected utility.

In Section EC.3.4 we provide a more comprehensive comparison of the relationship between an advertiser’s normalized reward and utility, with and without the offset of Section 5.3, for both the context-aware and baseline versions of our mechanism. In all cases, the payment offset increases the advertisers’ expected utility, and makes the relationship between an advertiser’s normalized reward and utility significantly more linear and positively correlated.

7. Conclusion

We have introduced a novel auction mechanism for aggregating preferences over LLM outputs, which provably converges to the theoretically optimal distribution. It also facilitates a principled method for balancing participants’ expected rewards with the divergence from a reference policy. Thus, our mechanism is particularly well-suited for online advertising, allowing the integration of advertiser LLMs with a reference LLM responsible for generating user-centric replies.

Our carefully-engineered payment rule removes any incentive to misreport preferences, achieving the central mechanism design goal of strategyproofness. While ex-post IR is incompatible with strategyproofness in this context, we experimentally show that our mechanism is ex-ante individually rational and “almost individually rational” in a certain sense. Furthermore, it ensures that each agent’s utility gain is proportionate to her contribution to social welfare, an alignment important for the long-term success of a mechanism in this setting.

Experimentally, we have demonstrated that by incorporating contextual information, our mechanism’s outputs rapidly converge to the optimal distribution, generating significant value for the participants while also effectively recapturing a considerable portion of this value as revenue. These findings demonstrate the practical efficacy and potential of our approach in real-world settings.

References

- Azar MG, Rowland M, Piot B, Guo D, Calandriello D, Valko M, Munos R (2023) A general theoretical paradigm to understand learning from human preferences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.12036*.
- Bai Y, Kadavath S, Kundu S, Askeel A, Kernion J, Jones A, Chen A, Goldie A, Mirhoseini A, McKinnon C, et al. (2022) Constitutional ai: Harmlessness from ai feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.08073*.
- Bommasani R, Hudson DA, Adeli E, Altman R, Arora S, von Arx S, Bernstein MS, Bohg J, Bosselut A, Brunskill E, Brynjolfsson E, Buch S, Card D, Castellon R, Chatterji N, Chen A, Creel K, Davis JQ, Demszky D, Donahue C, Doumbouya M, Durmus E, Ermon S, Etchemendy J, Ethayarajh K, Fei-Fei L, Finn C, Gale T, Gillespie L, Goel K, Goodman N, Grossman S, Guha N, Hashimoto T, Henderson P, Hewitt J, Ho DE, Hong J, Hsu K, Huang J, Icard T, Jain S, Jurafsky D, Kalluri P, Karamcheti S, Keeling G, Khani F, Khattab O, Koh PW, Krass M, Krishna R, Kuditipudi R, Kumar A, Ladhak F, Lee M, Lee T, Leskovec J, Levent I, Li XL, Li X, Ma T, Malik A, Manning CD, Mirchandani S, Mitchell E, Munyikwa Z, Nair S, Narayan A, Narayanan D, Newman B, Nie A, Niebles JC, Nilforoshan H, Nyarko J, Ogut G, Orr L, Papadimitriou I, Park JS, Piech C, Portelance E, Potts C, Raghunathan A, Reich R, Ren H, Rong F, Roohani Y, Ruiz C, Ryan J, Ré C, Sadigh D, Sagawa S, Santhanam K, Shih A, Srinivasan K, Tamkin A, Taori R, Thomas AW, Tramèr F, Wang RE, Wang W, Wu B, Wu J, Wu Y, Xie SM, Yasunaga M, You J, Zaharia M, Zhang M, Zhang T, Zhang X, Zhang Y, Zheng L, Zhou K, Liang P (2022) On the opportunities and risks of foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07258*.
- Clarke E (1971) Multipart pricing of public goods. *Public Choice* 11(1):17–33.
- Conitzer V, Freedman R, Heitzig J, Holliday WH, Jacobs BM, Lambert N, Mossé M, Pacuit E, Russell S, Schoelkopf H, Tewolde E, Zwicker WS (2024) Social choice for ai alignment: Dealing with diverse human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.10271*.
- Dubey KA, Feng Z, Kidambi R, Mehta A, Wang D (2024) Auctions with llm summaries. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.08126*.

- Duetting P, Mirrokni V, Leme RP, Xu H, Zuo S (2023) Mechanism design for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.10826*.
- Edelman B, Ostrovsky M, Schwarz M (2007) Internet advertising and the generalized second-price auction: Selling billions of dollars worth of keywords. *American Economic Review* 97(1):242–259.
- Feizi S, Hajiaghayi M, Rezaei K, Shin S (2024) Online advertisements with llms: Opportunities and challenges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.07601*.
- Fish S, Gözl P, Parkes DC, Procaccia AD, Rusak G, Shapira I, Wüthrich M (2023) Generative social choice. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.01291*.
- Frongillo RM, Kash IA (2021) General truthfulness characterizations via convex analysis. *Games and Economic Behavior* 130:636–662.
- Groves T (1973) Incentives in teams. *Econometrica* 41(4):617–631.
- Harris K, Immorlica N, Lucier B, Slivkins A (2024) Algorithmic persuasion through simulation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.18138* .
- Lehmann D, O’callaghan LI, Shoham Y (2002) Truth revelation in approximately efficient combinatorial auctions. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)* 49(5):577–602.
- Li K, Jelassi S, Zhang H, Kakade S, Wattenberg M, Brandfonbrener D (2024) Q-probe: A lightweight approach to reward maximization for language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.14688*.
- Myerson RB (1981) Optimal Auction Design. *Mathematics of Operations Research* 6(1).
- Nisan N, Ronen A (1999) Algorithmic mechanism design. *Proceedings of the thirty-first annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, 129–140.
- Nisan N, Ronen A (2007) Computationally Feasible VCG Mechanisms. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 29:19–47, ISSN 1076-9757.
- Peters J, Schaal S (2007) Reinforcement learning by reward-weighted regression for operational space control. *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 745–750, ICML ’07 (New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery), ISBN 9781595937933, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/1273496.1273590>.
- Rafailov R, Sharma A, Mitchell E, Ermon S, Manning CD, Finn C (2023) Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.18290*.
- Rochet JC (1987) A necessary and sufficient condition for rationalizability in a quasi-linear context. *Journal of Mathematical Economics* 16(2):191–200.
- Rozière B, Gehring J, Gloeckle F, Sootla S, Gat I, Tan XE, Adi Y, Liu J, Sauvestre R, Remez T, Rapin J, Kozhevnikov A, Evtimov I, Bitton J, Bhatt M, Ferrer CC, Grattafiori A, Xiong W, Défossez A, Copet J, Azhar F, Touvron H, Martin L, Usunier N, Scialom T, Synnaeve G (2024) Code llama: Open foundation models for code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12950*.

Touvron H, Martin L, Stone K, Albert P, Almahairi A, Babaei Y, Bashlykov N, Batra S, Bhargava P, Bhosale S, Bikel D, Blecher L, Ferrer CC, Chen M, Cucurull G, Esiobu D, Fernandes J, Fu J, Fu W, Fuller B, Gao C, Goswami V, Goyal N, Hartshorn A, Hosseini S, Hou R, Inan H, Kardas M, Kerkez V, Khabsa M, Kloumann I, Korenev A, Koura PS, Lachaux MA, Lavril T, Lee J, Liskovich D, Lu Y, Mao Y, Martinet X, Mihaylov T, Mishra P, Molybog I, Nie Y, Poulton A, Reizenstein J, Rungta R, Saladi K, Schelten A, Silva R, Smith EM, Subramanian R, Tan XE, Tang B, Taylor R, Williams A, Kuan JX, Xu P, Yan Z, Zarov I, Zhang Y, Fan A, Kambadur M, Narang S, Rodriguez A, Stojnic R, Edunov S, Scialom T (2023) Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*.

Varian HR (2007) Position auctions. *International Journal of Industrial Organization* 25(6):1163–1178.

Vickrey W (1961) Counterspeculation, auctions, and competitive sealed tenders. *The Journal of Finance* 16(1):8–37.

Ziegler DM, Stiennon N, Wu J, Brown TB, Radford A, Amodei D, Christiano P, Irving G (2020) Fine-tuning language models from human preferences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.08593*.

Electronic Companion

EC.1. Proofs and Theorems from Section 4

In this section, we present all omitted theorems and proofs from Section 4.

THEOREM EC.1. *Let $\pi_{\theta,M}(y|x)$ be the probability of sampling output sequence y for input sequence x according to Algorithm 1, where θ is the vector of all input parameters and M is the number of candidate sequences generated. Given the agents' reports $\vec{r} \in \vec{R}$, the policy induced by the mechanism approaches the following limit:*

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \pi_{\theta,M}(y|x) = \pi_{\text{ref}}(y|x) \frac{\exp(r(x,y)/\tau)}{\mathbb{E}_{y' \sim \pi_{\text{ref}}(\cdot|x)}[\exp(r(x,y')/\tau)]} \quad (\text{EC.1})$$

Theorem EC.1 Proof. Let $\pi_{\theta,M}(y|x, \{y_j\}_{j=1}^M)$ be the probability of returning output sequence y for input sequence x according to Algorithm 1 conditioned on the set of generated candidate sequences being $\{y_j\}_{j=1}^M$. Additionally, let $\pi_{\text{con}}(\{y_j\}_{j=1}^M|x;\vec{c})$ be the probability of the context-aware model π_{con} generating the candidate sequences $\{y_j\}_{j=1}^M$, given the context \vec{c} and the user query x .

First, note that we can write the density of $\pi_{\theta,M}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{\theta,M}(y|x) &= \sum_{\{y_j\}_{j=1}^M \in Y^M} \pi_{\theta,M}(y|x, \{y_j\}_{j=1}^M) \pi_{\text{con}}(\{y_j\}_{j=1}^M|x;\vec{c}) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\{y_j\}_{j=1}^M \sim \pi_{\text{con}}(\cdot|x;\vec{c})} \left[\pi_{\theta,M}(y|x, \{y_j\}_{j=1}^M) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\{y_j\}_{j=1}^M \sim \pi_{\text{con}}(\cdot|x;\vec{c})} \left[\frac{\sum_j \mathbb{I}\{y_j = y\} \exp\left(\frac{r(x,y_j)}{\tau} + \log \frac{\pi_{\text{ref}}(y_j|x)}{\pi_{\text{con}}(y_j|x;\vec{c})}\right)}{\sum_{\zeta \in \{y_j\}_{j=1}^M} \exp\left(\frac{r(x,\zeta)}{\tau} + \log \frac{\pi_{\text{ref}}(\zeta|x)}{\pi_{\text{con}}(\zeta|x;\vec{c})}\right)} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\{y_j\}_{j=1}^M \sim \pi_{\text{con}}(\cdot|x;\vec{c})} \left[\frac{\sum_j \mathbb{I}\{y_j = y\} \frac{\pi_{\text{ref}}(y_j|x)}{\pi_{\text{con}}(y_j|x;\vec{c})} \exp\left(\frac{r(x,y_j)}{\tau}\right)}{\sum_{\zeta \in \{y_j\}_{j=1}^M} \frac{\pi_{\text{ref}}(\zeta|x)}{\pi_{\text{con}}(\zeta|x;\vec{c})} \exp\left(\frac{r(x,\zeta)}{\tau}\right)} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\{y_j\}_{j=1}^M \sim \pi_{\text{con}}(\cdot|x;\vec{c})} \left[\frac{\sum_j \mathbb{I}\{y_j = y\}}{\sum_{\zeta \in \{y_j\}_{j=1}^M} \frac{\pi_{\text{ref}}(\zeta|x)}{\pi_{\text{con}}(\zeta|x;\vec{c})} \exp\left(\frac{r(x,\zeta)}{\tau}\right)} \right] \frac{\pi_{\text{ref}}(y|x)}{\pi_{\text{con}}(y|x;\vec{c})} \exp\left(\frac{r(x,y)}{\tau}\right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\{y_j\}_{j=1}^M \sim \pi_{\text{con}}(\cdot|x;\vec{c})} \left[\frac{\frac{1}{M} \sum_j \mathbb{I}\{y_j = y\}}{\frac{1}{M} \sum_{\zeta \in \{y_j\}_{j=1}^M} \frac{\pi_{\text{ref}}(\zeta|x)}{\pi_{\text{con}}(\zeta|x;\vec{c})} \exp\left(\frac{r(x,\zeta)}{\tau}\right)} \right] \frac{\pi_{\text{ref}}(y|x)}{\pi_{\text{con}}(y|x;\vec{c})} \exp\left(\frac{r(x,y)}{\tau}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Taking the limit as $M \rightarrow \infty$ and using the Law of Large Numbers (the sequences are i.i.d.):

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \pi_{\theta,M}(y|x) &= \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\{y_j\}_{j=1}^M \sim \pi_{\text{con}}(\cdot|x;\vec{c})} \left[\frac{\pi_{\text{con}}(y|x;\vec{c})}{\mathbb{E}_{\zeta \sim \pi_{\text{con}}(\cdot|x)} \left[\exp\left(\frac{r(x,\zeta)}{\tau}\right) \frac{\pi_{\text{ref}}(\zeta|x)}{\pi_{\text{con}}(\zeta|x;\vec{c})} \right]} \right] \frac{\pi_{\text{ref}}(y|x)}{\pi_{\text{con}}(y|x;\vec{c})} \exp\left(\frac{r(x,y)}{\tau}\right) \\ &= \pi_{\text{con}}(y|x;\vec{c}) \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}_{\zeta \sim \pi_{\text{con}}(\cdot|x)} \left[\exp\left(\frac{r(x,\zeta)}{\tau}\right) \frac{\pi_{\text{ref}}(\zeta|x)}{\pi_{\text{con}}(\zeta|x;\vec{c})} \right]} \frac{\pi_{\text{ref}}(y|x)}{\pi_{\text{con}}(y|x;\vec{c})} \exp\left(\frac{r(x,y)}{\tau}\right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \pi_{\text{ref}}(y|x) \frac{1}{\sum_{\zeta \in Y} \pi_{\text{con}}(\zeta|x) \exp\left(\frac{r(x,\zeta)}{\tau}\right) \frac{\pi_{\text{ref}}(\zeta|x)}{\pi_{\text{con}}(\zeta|x;\bar{c})}} \exp\left(\frac{r(x,y)}{\tau}\right) \\
&= \pi_{\text{ref}}(y|x) \frac{1}{\sum_{\zeta \in Y} \pi_{\text{ref}}(\zeta|x) \exp\left(\frac{r(x,\zeta)}{\tau}\right)} \exp\left(\frac{r(x,y)}{\tau}\right) \\
&= \pi_{\text{ref}}(y|x) \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}_{\zeta \sim \pi_{\text{ref}}(\cdot|x)} [\exp(r(x,\zeta)/\tau)]} \exp\left(\frac{r(x,y)}{\tau}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 1 Proof. The proof follows directly from Theorem [EC.1](#) and Appendix A.1 in [Rafailov et al. \(2023\)](#). □

EC.2. Details from Section 5

In this section, we present all omitted details from Section 5.

EC.2.1. Omitted Proofs from Section 5.1

Theorem 1 Proof. Let $\vec{r}_i = (r_i(x, y_1), \dots, r_i(x, y_M))$ be the reward reports of agent i for the M generated candidate sequences. Then, for both allocation rules, holding the candidate sequences and the reports of all other agents fixed, the ex-interim allocation rule (i.e., the probability of returning each of the M generated candidate sequences) from agent i 's perspective is:

$$\pi_{\text{int}}(\vec{r}_i; \vec{\beta}_{-i}) = \text{softmax}\left(\frac{\vec{r}_i}{\tau} + \vec{\beta}_{-i}\right), \quad (\text{EC.2})$$

where $\vec{\beta}_{-i,j} = \frac{\sum_{k \in N \setminus \{i\}} r_k(x, y_j)}{\tau} + \log \frac{\pi_{\text{ref}}(y_j|x)}{\pi_{\text{con}}(y_j|x; \vec{c})}$. Importantly $\vec{\beta}_{-i}$ is an M -dimensional vector that does not depend on agent i 's reports.

We would like to equip π_{int} with a payment rule $p(\vec{r}_i; \vec{\beta}_{-i})$ so that the resulting interim mechanism will be strategyproof. This requires that π_{int} have a property known as *cyclic monotonicity*. Equivalently, π_{int} must be the (sub)gradient of agent i 's utility for bidding truthfully in the mechanism $U(\vec{r}_i; \vec{\beta}_{-i})$, and that utility function must be convex (Frongillo and Kash 2021, Rochet 1987, Myerson 1981).

It is easy to verify that for the function class:

$$U_C(\vec{r}_i; \vec{\beta}_{-i}) = \tau \log \left(\sum_{j=1}^M \exp \left(\frac{r_i(x, y_j)}{\tau} + \vec{\beta}_{-i,j} \right) \right) + C, \quad C \in \mathbb{R} \quad (\text{EC.3})$$

the allocation rule $\pi_{\text{int}}(\vec{r}_i; \vec{\beta}_{-i})$ is a gradient of $U_C(\vec{r}_i; \vec{\beta}_{-i})$. Additionally, $U_C(\vec{r}_i; \vec{\beta}_{-i})$ is convex in \vec{r}_i : The exponential function e^x is (strictly) convex, because its second derivative is positive. The transformation $\frac{r_i(x, y_j)}{\tau} + \vec{\beta}_{-i,j}$ is an affine transformation of $r_i(x, y_j)$, and affine transformations preserve convexity. Finally, it is well-known that the LogSumExp function is convex.

Thus, for any $\vec{\beta}_{-i}$ and for any set of generated candidate sequences, reporting truthfully maximizes agent i 's expected utility, with the expectation taken over the draw of the final sequence from the set of candidate sequences. Adopting the quasi-linear utility model, agent i 's payment is:

$$\begin{aligned} U_C(\vec{r}_i; \vec{\beta}_{-i}) &= \pi_{\text{int}}(\vec{r}_i; \vec{\beta}_{-i}) \cdot \vec{r}_i - p(\vec{r}_i; \vec{\beta}_{-i}) \\ p(\vec{r}_i; \vec{\beta}_{-i}) &= \pi_{\text{int}}(\vec{r}_i; \vec{\beta}_{-i}) \cdot \vec{r}_i - U_C(\vec{r}_i; \vec{\beta}_{-i}) \\ p(\vec{r}_i; \vec{\beta}_{-i}) &= \pi_{\text{int}}(\vec{r}_i; \vec{\beta}_{-i}) \cdot \vec{r}_i - \tau \log \left(\sum_{j=1}^M \exp \left(\frac{r_i(x, y_j)}{\tau} + \vec{\beta}_{-i,j} \right) \right) - C, \quad C \in \mathbb{R} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{EC.4})$$

□

EC.2.2. Our mechanism is “almost individually rational”

First, we explain why the standard notion of individual rationality (i.e., weakly positive utility from participation in the mechanism) encountered in most auction settings is impossible to achieve in this domain while converging to the optimal distribution and maintaining incentive compatibility. Then, we explain how, with our payment offset, our mechanism is “almost IR:” In Lemma EC.1 we prove that the ex-interim utility of an agent who has zero reward for all candidate sequences and bids truthfully is deterministically zero, i.e., agents that do not contribute to the social welfare (but also do not detract from it) have zero utility. Similarly, in Lemma EC.2 we prove that if an agent’s reward for all candidate sequences is (weakly) positive, then her ex-interim utility is (weakly) positive.

Why is individual rationality (IR) impossible? Individual rationality (IR) stipulates that an agent gains more utility by participating and bidding truthfully in a mechanism than by not participating at all. Typically, if an agent’s utility for non-participation is zero, participating should yield weakly positive utility. However, this simplification does not apply in our setting.

As discussed in Section 5.2, agent i ’s reward for any sequence y can be arbitrarily negative (Equation (EC.5)). The same is true for the utility from truthful participation, as outlined in Equation (EC.3). To ensure a positive utility for every agent in our mechanism, an offset would need to be infinitely large or dependent on agent i ’s reports. But then the mechanism’s allocation rule would no longer be the gradient of agent i ’s utility with respect to her reports, which would destroy strategyproofness (Frongillo and Kash 2021, Rochet 1987, Myerson 1981).

It is important to note that this challenge is inherent not just to our mechanism but to any mechanism in this setting that operates with a fixed set of sequences, aims to approximate the optimal distribution, and maintains strategyproofness. Under these conditions, the only allocation rule that approximates the theoretically optimal distribution (Equation (2)) is that of our mechanism. However, this uniquely determines the agents’ utilities, up to a constant factor, as described in Equation (EC.3) (Frongillo and Kash 2021, Rochet 1987, Myerson 1981).

LEMMA EC.1. *For the payment offset $C = -\tau \log \left(\sum_{j=1}^M \exp \left(\vec{\beta}_{-i,j} \right) \right)$ if agent i ’s reward for all candidate sequences is zero, then her ex-interim utility is deterministically zero, for all $\vec{\beta}_{-i} \in \vec{R}_{-i}$.*

Lemma EC.1 Proof. First, note that for all $\vec{\beta}_{-i} \in \vec{R}_{-i}$, agent i ’s expected reward for the outcome is zero, as $\pi_{\text{int}}(\vec{r}_i; \vec{\beta}_{-i}) \cdot \vec{r}_i = \pi_{\text{int}}(\vec{r}_i; \vec{\beta}_{-i}) \cdot \vec{0} = 0$. Additionally, agent i ’s reward for the realized outcome will deterministically be zero, as her reward for all generated candidate sequences is zero. Finally, note that by setting $\vec{r}_i = \vec{0}$ in Equation (EC.4) with the offset C set as in Section 5.3, we have that the agent i ’s payment is also deterministically zero. Thus, an agent with zero reward for all generated candidate sequences who reports her rewards truthfully has deterministically zero reward for the final outcome and zero payments, and her utility is also deterministically zero. \square

LEMMA EC.2. *For the payment offset $C = -\tau \log \left(\sum_{j=1}^M \exp \left(\vec{\beta}_{-i,j} \right) \right)$ if agent i 's reward for all candidate sequences is positive, then her ex-interim utility is positive, for all reports $\vec{\beta}_{-i} \in \vec{R}_{-i}$.*

Lemma EC.1 establishes that when agent i 's reward for all candidate sequences is zero, her utility for truthfully bidding in the mechanism, denoted as $U(\vec{0}; \vec{\beta}_{-i})$, is zero for all possible reports of the other agents $\vec{\beta}_{-i} \in \vec{R}_{-i}$.

Furthermore, Theorem 1 shows that the mechanism's allocation rule corresponds to the gradient of agent i 's utility when bidding truthfully. Because the allocation rule is non-negative, the gradient of agent i 's utility for bidding truthfully is also non-negative.

Thus, if agent i 's rewards for all candidate sequences are weakly positive, and considering the non-negative gradient of her utility, her ex-interim utility under truthful bidding must be positive, irrespective of the other agents' reports $\vec{\beta}_{-i}$. \square

COROLLARY EC.1. *For the payment offset $C = -\tau \log \left(\sum_{j=1}^M \exp \left(\vec{\beta}_{-i,j} \right) \right)$ if the distribution π_{con} only generates candidate sequences for which agent i 's reward is positive, then the ex-ante expected utility of the agent is positive.*

Corollary EC.1 Proof. This follows immediately from the fact that the ex-ante utility of the agent is the expectation of her ex-interim utility with respect to her reward for the generated sequences, and the fact that the second quantity is positive whenever the reward of the agent for all candidate sequences is positive from Lemma EC.2. \square

EC.2.3. Differences from Standard Auction Settings

Standard auction environments typically rely on a set of assumptions that simplify mechanism design; however, these assumptions do not apply to auctions for LLM-generated content. In this section, we detail these assumptions and discuss why they are inapplicable in our context.

First, in a standard auction setting, it is common to assume that the agents' valuation functions satisfy free disposal, i.e., $v_i(S) \geq v_i(S') \forall S \supseteq S', S, S' \subseteq \mathcal{I}$. The interpretation of free disposal is that an agent can discard any items she is allocated that she is not interested in. Free disposal combined with the fact that an agent has zero value for the empty bundle mean that her value for any outcome is weakly positive. Second, in most auction environments, the allocation rule is different for different agents: each agent will get allocated her own bundle of items, and we can assume that she is indifferent to the allocation of items to the other agents.

As detailed in Rafailov et al. (2023), assuming that an agent's LLM π_i was trained to maximize her reward function (and regularized with respect to its KL divergence from some reference LLM, which we assume to be the same as the auctioneer's reference LLM), there is a one-to-many mapping between an advertiser's optimal LLM, and her implicit reward function. That mapping is:

$$r_i(x, y) = \tau_i \log \frac{\pi_i(y|x)}{\pi_{ref}(y|x)} + \log Z_i(x) \quad (\text{EC.5})$$

where $Z_i(x)$ is a prompt-dependent constant, and τ_i is the regularization hyperparameter of agent i , similar to the one in Equation (1). All functions in the class defined in Equation (EC.5) are equivalent, in the sense that they induce exactly the same LLM (Rafailov et al. 2023). This has two implications: First, unlike standard auction environments, an agent’s reward can go negative – there is nothing equivalent to the free disposal property. Setting $Z_i(x)$ to zero (which is equivalent to normalizing the induced probabilities by the LLM (Rafailov et al. 2023)), the agent’s reward is negative for any sequence for which her LLM assigns a lower probability than π_{ref} .

Second, especially in the online advertising application, an agent’s expected utility for not participating in the auction is negative: if advertiser i does not participate in the auction, her payment is zero, but her expected value for the outcome is

$$\pi_{\theta_{-i},M}(\vec{\beta}_{-i}) \cdot \vec{r}_i \tag{EC.6}$$

The other advertisers have very low rewards for the sequences that mention advertiser i : assuming their LLMs have been properly trained, they will evaluate all sequences that explicitly mention a different, possibly competing brand, as unlikely. Thus, based on Equation (EC.5) the corresponding advertisers have very low rewards for those sequences and conversely, agent i has low rewards for the sequences that the other advertisers have high rewards for. But based on Equation (2), if advertiser i does not participate in the auction, $\pi_{\theta_{-i},M}(\vec{\beta}_{-i})$ will assign high probabilities to sequences for which i has low rewards for. Thus, Equation (EC.6) implies that, unlike standard auction environments, the advertiser’s expected reward and utility for not participating in the mechanism is negative.

EC.2.4. “What you give is what you get”

As we explained in Section 5.3.2, Our choice of allocation rule (which is the only allocation rule over a finite set of sequences that converges to the optimal distribution), combined with the fact that the allocation rule is the gradient of the utility to ensure truthfulness, means that agent utilities must also be the same up to potentially agent-specific offsets as indicated by Equation (4):

$$U_C(\vec{r}_i; \vec{\beta}_{-i}) = \tau \log \left(\sum_{j=1}^M \exp \left(\frac{1}{\tau} \sum_{k \in N} r_k(x, y_j) \right) + \log \frac{\pi_{\text{ref}}(y_j|x)}{\pi_{\text{con}}(y_j|x; \vec{c})} \right) + C, C \in \mathbb{R} \quad (\text{EC.7})$$

However, not all agents contribute equally to the social welfare of the final outcome. Because of this, implementing the mechanism without a carefully-designed offset would lead to a kind of “reverse market unraveling:” as long as an agent’s utility in Equation (EC.7) is positive, she would be incentivized to participate, even if the user query was completely unrelated to her business, because the mechanism would ensure that she received, on expectation, the same (positive) expected utility from doing so as any other participating agent.⁶

Incentivizing unrelated agents to participate would have adverse effects. First, the better-performing context-aware mechanism would create candidate sequences with worse rewards for *all* agents, because its context would be “diluted” from agents unrelated to the user query. In our running example for the user query “How do I bake cookies?”, imagine adding “Try to mention ‘EasySwitch’, a comprehensive VPN service” to the context of the context-aware LLM $\pi_{\text{con}}(\cdot|x; \vec{c})$.

Additionally, for both versions of the mechanism, following the discussion in Section 5.2, the agents for whom the user query is unrelated are more likely to have negative rewards for the generated sequences as their LLMs will deem the candidate sequences more unlikely than the reference LLM. Thus, based on Equation (4), their participation in the mechanism will lead to a reduction of the total sum of rewards of the generated sequences for the agents, which will indirectly reduce the expected utility of all agents, making the mechanism less attractive for the user-query-relevant agents.

To summarize, all agents receiving the same utility would incentivize agents for whom the user query is unrelated to participate in the auction. This would in turn reduce everyone’s expected utility, potentially reducing the incentive for the user-query-relevant agents to participate, and lead to sequences with worse expected rewards for the agents and usefulness for the user.⁷ Thus, in the application of auctions for aggregating agents’ preferences over LLM-generated outputs, agents with higher contribution to social welfare also receiving proportionally higher utility by the mechanism is important for the long-term success of the mechanism in practice.

⁶ We can assume that agents can estimate their expected utility from participation using historical data from past auctions, analogously to how they can estimate their utility for participating in sponsored search auctions.

⁷ If we interpret the KL divergence between the distribution induced by the reference LLM and the LLM that generated the candidate sequences as a measure of their expected usefulness for the user.

EC.3. Details from Section 6

EC.3.1. Detailed Experiment Setup

We create a set of synthetic instances to test our mechanism. Each instance consists of a user query, e.g. “How do I bake cookies?” and a list of advertisers. Each advertiser is defined by an “advertiser name”, e.g. “KitchenFix” and an advertiser description, e.g., “producing kitchen appliances.”⁸ The reference LLM π_{ref} responsible for generating replies that are useful for the agent is Llama-2-7b-chat-hf (Touvron et al. 2023). The advertisers’ LLMs are created using the same reference LLM, and adding the instruction: “Answer the question advertising $\langle \text{advertiser} \rangle$, $\langle \text{advertiser description} \rangle$.” The context aware LLM is created using the same reference LLM, and adding the instruction: “Answer the query. Try to mention $\langle \text{advertiser 1} \rangle$, who $\langle \text{advertiser description 1} \rangle$ and $\langle \text{advertiser 2} \rangle$, who $\langle \text{advertiser description 2} \rangle$.”

Following (Rafailov et al. 2023) the reward function of advertiser i is set to $r_i(x, y) = \log \frac{\pi_i(y|x)}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(y|x)}$, where π_i is advertiser i ’s LLM, i.e., we set $\tau_i = 1, Z_i(x) = 1$ for all advertisers and for all user prompts in Equation (EC.5).⁹ For the auctioneer’s objective as defined in Equation (1) we set $\tau = 1$, balancing between the advertisers’ expected rewards for the generated sequences and the sequences’ divergence from the reference LLM responsible for generating useful replies for the user. Thus, the optimal policy according to Equation (2) becomes:

$$\pi_r(y|x) = \frac{1}{Z(x)} \pi_{\text{ref}}(y|x) \exp \left(\sum_{i \in N} r_i(x, y) \right) \quad (\text{EC.8})$$

Following Li et al. (2024), Rozière et al. (2024) we sample from the LLM generating the sequences (either π_{ref} or π_{con}) with temperature 0.8 and top-p 0.95. We use 50 user queries, each with two interested advertisers. To increase the statistical significance of our results, we test each user query on 25 different random seeds, effectively resulting in 1250 individual instances. The seed affects both the generation of the candidate sequences, and the randomized sampling of the final sequence from the candidate sequences. We will make all of our code and set of synthetic instances publicly available. Our compute infrastructure is detailed in Section EC.3.2.

EC.3.2. Compute Infrastructure

All experiments were conducted on a compute cluster running Ubuntu 20.04.6 LTS with AMD EPYC processors with 48 cores and 1512GB RAM and Nvidia A100 GPUs and Python 3.12.1.

⁸ Following Duetting et al. (2023), we use fictitious brand names to avoid the model using any existing ad.

⁹ Note that we cannot estimate the true value of $Z_i(x)$. However, it is a query-dependent constant. Given that our experiments focus on the reward difference of different sequences for the same query, this is a non-issue.

EC.3.3. Comparison of baseline and context-aware mechanism outputs

To provide some intuition of how the context-aware mechanism improves the relevance of generated responses for the advertisers, we present a side-by-side comparison of outputs from both mechanisms for a specific query in Table EC.1. Note that only the context-aware mechanism is able to incorporate the advertisers into the reply to the user’s query.

User query
What are effective ways to learn a musical instrument online?
Advertisers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MusicMastery: offering online music lessons and virtual tutoring - InstaTune: selling musical instruments and learning aids
Context-Aware Mechanism Output
<p>Effective ways to learn a musical instrument online include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Online music lessons: Platforms like MusicMastery offer one-on-one virtual tutoring, group classes, and pre-recorded lessons. These lessons can be tailored to your skill level and learning style. 2. Interactive learning tools: InstaTune offers a range of interactive learning tools, such as apps, software, and games, that make learning fun and engaging. 3. Practice with technology: Utilize digital tools like metronomes, tuners, and recording software to practice and track your progress. 4. Collaborate with other musicians: Join online communities, forums, and social media groups to connect with other musicians and learn from their experiences. . . .
Baseline Mechanism Output
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Practice consistently and regularly: Consistent practice is essential to learning any musical instrument, and it’s even more important when learning online. Set aside a specific time each day or week to practice, and make sure to stick to it. - Find a good teacher or mentor: While it’s possible to learn some things on your own, working with a good teacher or mentor can help you improve faster and avoid developing bad habits. Look for someone who is experienced and knowledgeable in the type of music you want to learn. - Use technology to your advantage: There are many online tools and resources available that can help you learn an instrument. These include video lessons, online tutorials, and apps that can help you practice and track your progress. . . .

Table EC.1 Comparison of context-aware and baseline mechanism outputs using 10 candidate sequences. Advertisers highlighted in bold, outputs truncated to conserve space.

EC.3.4. Comprehensive Experimental Evaluation of the Offset from Section 5.3




Figure EC.1 Comparison of total advertiser utility gain from participation with, and without the payment offset, as a function of the number of candidate sequences generated using π_{ref} and π_{con} . Averaged over 1250 runs including 95% CIs.

In this section, we provide a comprehensive experimental evaluation of the payment offset introduced in Section 5.3. Figure EC.1 explores the effectiveness of the payment offset introduced in Section 5.3 in ensuring that our mechanism is ex-ante IR, i.e., agents have positive expected utility gains from participating. To that end, we compare the advertiser utility gain from participation with and without the payment offset, as a function of the number of candidate sequences generated by the context-aware (Figure EC.1a) and baseline (Figure EC.1b) versions of our mechanism.

In Figure EC.1a we observe that for the context-aware version of our mechanism, adding the payment offset introduced of Section 5.3 to the payment rule is enough to ensure positive expected utility for the advertisers (conditioned on the fact that they are related to the user’s query), i.e., make the mechanism ex-ante IR. Notably, without the payment offset, advertisers have very negative expected utility from participating in the mechanism.

In Figure EC.1b we observe that for the baseline version of our mechanism, adding the payment offset introduced of Section 5.3 to the payment rule causes a very large increase in the advertisers’ expected utility, but it is still not enough to ensure positive expected utility for the advertisers. To conclude, Figure EC.1 demonstrates that the offset introduced in Section 5.3 causes a large increase in the advertisers’ expected utility, which in case of the context-aware version of the mechanism, is also enough to make the mechanism ex-ante IR.

Figures EC.2 and EC.3 explore the effectiveness of the payment offset introduced in Section 5.3 in aligning an advertiser’s utility with her contribution to the social welfare. In Figure EC.2 we compare the scatter plots of the advertiser reward and utility gain from participation in the mechanism, with and without the payment offset introduced in Section 5.3 for candidate sequences




Figure EC.2 Comparative scatter plots of advertiser reward and utility gain from participation, with and without the payment offset of Section 5.3 for candidate sequences generated by the context-aware LLM π_{gen} . We additionally show a linear regressor fit to that data, its slope and its R^2 .




Figure EC.3 Comparative scatter plots of advertiser reward and utility gain from participation, with and without the payment offset of Section 5.3 for candidate sequences generated by the reference π_{ref} . We additionally show a linear regressor fit to that data, its slope and its R^2 .

generated using the context-aware LLM π_{ref} . Additionally, for both subfigures, we show a linear regressor fitted to the data, as well as its slope and coefficient of determination. Comparing the two subfigures, it is immediately obvious that adding the offset to the payments makes the relationship between advertiser reward and utility gain far more linear. This is confirmed by the coefficient of determination of the linear regressors fit to each dataset. The coefficient of determination of the linear regressor is far larger when we use the offset. Without the payment offset, the coefficient of determination is almost 0, indicating that, without our payment offset, reward gain is not a predictive measure of an agent’s utility. Additionally, the slope of the linear regressor is also higher for the scatter plot with the payment offset.

In Figure EC.3 we make the same comparison, but for candidate sequences generated using the reference LLM π_{ref} . The results are now even more pronounced. In Figure EC.3a we observe the relationship between advertiser utility and reward gain with our payment offset is almost perfectly linear, as suggested by the linear regressor fitted to the data having a slope of 1.00 and an extremely high coefficient of determination of 0.96, indicating that it can almost perfectly fit the data. Without our payment offset however, in Figure EC.3b we can see that the relationship between the two metrics is again both less linear, and less positively correlated, as the slope of the linear regressor is 0.5 and its coefficient of determination is only 0.19.

To conclude, in all cases tested, the use of the agent-specific offset introduced in Section 5.3 increases an advertiser’s expected utility, makes the relationship between an advertiser’s contribution to social welfare and her utility both more linear and more positively correlated, and, for the context-aware version of our mechanism, can ensure positive expected utility for the advertisers.